UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/588,720	01/10/2007	Patrick Moireau	294251US0PCT	1968	
	7590 11/02/201 AK, MCCLELLAND 1	EXAMINER			
1940 DUKE STREET			GRAY, JILL M		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1798			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/02/2010	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/588,720	MOIREAU ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Jill Gray	1798		

	Examine	Air Oille						
	Jill Gray	1798						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 19 October 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time								
periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3 months from the mailing date</u>	of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO								
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extensions of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS		20 1 b 1 1 b						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) They raise new issues that would require further con 			cause					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•	L below),						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	•	lucing or simplifying t	he issues for					
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a o	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		otou olamno.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			,					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proven the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected:								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce hecause:					
Applicants' arguments have been considered but are no requires "a polyacrylic." This language is broad and doe teaches the advantages of forming conductive composit comprise conductive particles in flake form. This teaching electrically conducting particles in flake form being used advantages of carbon flakes in forming electrically conductive particles.	t found to be persuasive. As to the es not exclude the polyacrylates of Lions that can be used on glass subsing would have suggested to the skil as a coating on glass substrates.	polyacrylates of Lin, a Lin. As to the teaching strates wherein the co lled artisan the advan	applicants' claim gs of Miller, he empositions tages of					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).								
13.								

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

/Jill Gray/ Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1798

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20101026

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment to claim 1 raises new issues because the incorporation of the limitations of claim 3 into claim 1 now results in claim 2 being broader than claim 1. Claim 2 requires that the film former be a polymer, which is broader than the now specifically defined film formers. Also, because claim 3 originally depended on claim 2, this amendment does not constitute merely rewriting claim 3 as an independent claim (which is permissible if claim 3 depended upon claim 1). Moreover, the proposed amendment to claim 9 raises new issues because claim 9 previously was not limited to any particular type of film forming agent.